

## REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 18-19, 21, 26, 28, 33-38, 44-47, and 51-52 are pending. Claims 4-17, 20, 22-25, 27, 29-32, 39-43, and 48-50 were previously canceled. The Office Action rejects Claims 1-3, 18-19, 21, 26, 28, 33-38, 44-47, and 51-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,963,570 to Agarwal ("Agarwal") in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0026620 to Johansson et al. ("Johansson"). In light of the subsequent remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance

### The Rejection of Independent Claims 1, 33, and 44 under §103(a) is Overcome

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a method comprising receiving a data packet at an input interface. The received data packet comprises a header section and a pay-load section. The header section comprises a compressed header section containing coded information including routing information. The method additionally comprises decompressing said routing information from said compressed header section. The method also comprises including at least a part of said decompressed routing information into said data packet. The method further comprises routing said data packet to an output interface. The method additionally comprises forwarding said data packet to said output interface, wherein said routing comprises ascertaining said routing information from said compressed header section, and wherein said coded information is left unchanged by said routing and forwarding. Independent Claims 33 and 44 are directed to apparatuses and though they have their own respective scopes, include substantially similar features as Claim 1 insofar as this discussion is concerned.

The Office Action alleges that the independent claims (Claims 1, 33, and 44) are unpatentable over the combination of Agarwal and Johansson. However, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, as the combination of Agarwal and Johansson fails to teach or suggest each of the features recited in the independent claims. In this regard, the independent claims each recite the features of decompressing routing information from the compressed header section and including at least a part of the decompressed routing

information into the data packet. The Office Action alleges col. 1, lines 15-28 of Agarwal discloses decompressing routing information from the compressed header section. The cited portion of Agarwal relates to “a method and apparatus for compressing and decompressing the headers of ATM cells or of segmented packets (Spackets) in order to provide additional capacity within ATM frames or Spacket frames for error correction and the like.” The Office Action further alleges that col. 1, lines 43-52 of Agarwal disclose including at least a part of the decompressed routing information into the data packet. However, at most this cited portion discloses that the header information includes routing information. The cited portions of Agarwal clearly do not teach or suggest that routing information that is decompressed from a compressed header section is then inserted into the data packet. As such, the cited portions of Agarwal fail to teach or suggest the claim features which they are alleged, as Agarwal fails to teach or suggest decompressing routing information from a compressed header section and including at least a part of the decompressed routing information into the data packet.

Moreover, Johansson, even when taken in combination with Agarwal, fails to cure the readily apparent deficiencies of Agarwal. As such, the independent claims are patentably distinct from the combination of Agarwal and Johansson such that the rejection is overcome. Applicants further respectfully submit that none of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, cure the deficiencies of the combination of Agarwal and Johansson. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims are in condition for allowance.

#### The Rejection of the Dependent Claims is Overcome

Because each of the dependent claims includes each of the recitations of a respective independent base claim, Applicants further submit that the dependent claims are patentably distinguishable from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, for at least those reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of the dependent claims are overcome and the dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks presented above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the present claims of the present application are in condition for immediate allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Leyes  
Registration No. 61,317

**Customer No. 00826**  
**ALSTON & BIRD LLP**  
Bank of America Plaza  
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000  
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000  
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000  
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES  
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON January 14, 2011.**